



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/362,521	07/28/1999	YUNZHOU LI	10360/027001	6953

34845 7590 03/04/2003

STEUBING AND MCGUINNESS & MANARAS LLP
30 NAGOG PARK DRIVE
ACTON, MA 01720

EXAMINER

PRIETO, BEATRIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/362,521

Applicant(s)

LI, YUNZHOU

Examiner

B. Prieto

Art Unit

2142

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see supplemental.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 1-7, 9-13, 15-20 and 22.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of 10. Other: Amendment after-final to correct typographical error on claim 13 will be entered..


MARK POWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

2/21/03
(61)

Supplemental Advisory Action

1. This communication is in response to request for reconsideration filed 02/19/03, claims 1-7, 9-13, 14-20 and 22 remain pending. Final rejection is maintained.

2. Applicant argues (a) in regards to claim 1, that prior art does not teach claim limitation as recited, specifically, constructing a multicast routing table and a unicast routing table from the received link state packets, and table corresponding to a short tree through multicast routers...because there is no verbatim recitation of the terms "multicast routing table" or "unicast routing table."

In response to argument (a), it is respectfully noted that in accordance with MPEP §2106 Patentability: Office personnel must rely on the applicant's disclosure to properly determine the meaning of terms used in the claims. *Markman v. Westview Instruments*, 52 F.3d 967, 980, 34 USPQ2d 1321, 1330 (Fed. Cir.) (en banc), aff'd, U.S. , 116 S. Ct. 1384 (1996). An applicant is entitled to be his or her own lexicographer, and in many instances will provide an explicit definition for certain terms used in the claims. Where an explicit definition is provided by the applicant for a term, that definition will control interpretation of the term as it is used in the claim. *Toro Co. v. White Consolidated Industries Inc.*, 199 F.3d 1295, 1301, 53 USPQ2d 1065, 1069 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (meaning of words used in a claim is not construed in a "lexicographic vacuum, but in the context of the specification and drawings."). Claims and disclosures are not to be evaluated in a vacuum. Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). See also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow.... As a way by which uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process."

Therefore claim (1) reads constructing an orderly arrangement of data (table) (called "multicast routing table" and "unicast routing table") from the received link information (state) packets, and table corresponding to information regarding the links, routes and cost (i.e. a short path tree) through interconnecting device with routing capabilities to multiple destinations (multicast routers) (see specification page 4, line 3 to page 6, line 10).

Prior art teaches constructing a routing table (database topology of (link-state advertisement (LSA) broadcast, i.e. from routers in network area to support routing algorithms) from the received link

state (advertisement) packets, the table corresponding to a short path tree through unicast routers (OSPF: col 1/lines 27-43, database of the network topology using a link state routing topology, i.e. unicast group members), constructing an unicast routing table from the received link state advertisements (Haggerty: col 10/lines 56-col 11/line 19); and constructing an added new routing table (database topology of (link-state advertisement (LSA) broadcast, i.e. from routers in network area) from the received link state (advertisement) packets, the table corresponding to a short path tree through multicast routers (MOSPF: col 1/lines 56-col 2/line 11).

3. Applicant argues (b) in regards to claim 1, that the prior art is silent as to how the routing data is stored.

In response to argument (b) that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., how routing data may be stored) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

4. Applicant argues (c) in regards to claim 1, that there is no motivation for the modification presented in office action, because applicant fails to see how the use of two routing tables would reduce resources for storing network advertisement.

In response to argument (c), that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, motivation was provided by the reference, see *Crawley*, col 2/lines 24-54.

5. Applicant's arguments filed 02/19/03 have been fully considered but not rendered persuasive.

6. Prosecution of this application is closed by means of this final office action § 1.113, applicant may request continued examination of the application by filing a Request for Continued Examination of under 37 CFR § 1.114 and providing the corresponding fee set forth in § 1.17(e) for the submission of, but not limited to, new arguments, an information disclosure statement, an amendment to the written description, claims, drawings, or new evidence in support of patentability. Or applicant whose claims has been twice

rejected, may appeal from the decision of the administrative patent judge to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences under 35 U.S.C. §134.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0750. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Mark R. Powell can be reached on (703) 305-9703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-6606. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or Faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, for Official communications and entry


Or:

(703) 746-7240, for Non-Official or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT".

Or Telephone:

(703) 306-5631 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


B. Prieto
TC 2100
Patent Examiner
February 26, 2003


MARK POWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100